

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Engstrom, G. Eric

Application No.: 09/872,686

Filed: May 31, 2001

For: Time Slot Based Calendar  
Access Control

Examiner: Cam Y. T. Truong

Art Unit: 2162

Confirmation No.: 2508

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Dear Sir:

Appellant hereby acknowledges receipt of the Examiner's Answer, mailed April 7, 2008, and offers the following remarks in reply.

The Examiner relies repeatedly on the conclusion that Vincent teaches time-slot based access privileges. Instead, Vincent teaches event-based access privileges. Claim 1 recites that "the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar".

The Examiner notes that Vincent teaches the assignment of access privileges when an event is created. At that time, the user enters a start time and an end time and an access level. The Examiner further notes in Paragraph 10.1 (page 21) that a time-slot of an owner's calendar may read "Access Permission Required." The Examiner is overlooking the fact that the item requiring access permission for viewing is an event, not simply the time period of 5:00-6:00pm, etc. That access level does not apply to the time period (5:00pm-6:00pm) in which the event falls.

For example, if the event is rescheduled from the 5:00pm-6:00pm time slot to say 8:00pm-9:00pm, the user will continue to be able to access the event now scheduled for the new time-slot 8:00pm- 9:00pm, but may or may not be able to access a new or

replacement event in the old time-slot of 5:00pm–6:00pm. To the extent the user can still access the 5:00pm–6:00pm time-slot, it is because the user is authorized to access the new or replacement event, again not because the user is authorized to generally access the time-slot of 5:00pm–6:00pm (independent of any other consideration, including what event, if any, is currently scheduled in the time-slot). Such a teaching is quite distinct and teaches away from the recitations of claim 1.

Thus, Vincent does not teach or suggest defining access privileges based on the specific time-slots, as is recited in claim 1, but rather Vincent defines access privileges based on events independent of the schedule time of the event.

### **Conclusion**

As discussed in Appellants Appeal Brief, the Examiner overstated the teachings of Vincent and Barnett, and in a variety of locations, misinterpreted the teachings of the references to provide inappropriate rejections of the claims based on these references.

Thus, as Appellants have set forth in the brief, the Examiner has erred in the Examiner's rejections. Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Date: April 29, 2008

/Steven J. Prewitt/  
by Steven J. Prewitt, Reg. No. 45,023  
Attorney for Assignee

Pacwest Center  
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Phone: (503) 222-9981  
FAX: (503) 796-2900